

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/867,333	05/29/2001	Kurt G. Robson	ORCL5727	ORCL5727 6000	
53156	7590 03/15/2006		EXAM	EXAMINER	
YOUNG LAW FIRM, P.C. 4370 ALPINE RD.			JARRETT,	JARRETT, SCOTT L	
STE. 106	,,		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
PORTOLA VALLEY, CA 94028			3623		

DATE MAILED: 03/15/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
09/867,333	ROBSON ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Scott L. Jarrett	3623	

Advisory Action	09/867,333	67,333 ROBSON ET AL.				
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Scott L. Jarrett	3623				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress			
THE REPLY FILED 27 February 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS	APPLICATION IN CONDITION FO	R ALLOWANCE.				
<ol> <li>The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance time periods:</li> <li>The period for reply expires 4 months from the mailing date</li> </ol>	wing replies: (1) an amendment, aff stice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in one ce with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply mu	idavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	nce, which FR 41.31; or (3)			
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailin	g date of the final rejecti	ion.			
TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7	06.07(f).					
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ex under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply orig r than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The appropr inally set in the final Offi te of the final rejection, of	iate extension fee ice action; or (2) as even if timely filed,			
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exte a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed AMENDMENTS</li> </ol>	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of th	ns of the date of ne appeal. Since			
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,	but prior to the date of filing a brief.	will not be entered h	ecause			
(a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);						
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo	• •					
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in being appeal; and/or	tter form for appeal by materially re	ducing or simplifying	the issues for			
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a	corresponding number of finally rej	ected claims.				
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).						
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1		mpliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).			
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): See Continuation Sheet.						
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>	lowable if submitted in a separate,	timely filed amendme	ent canceling the			
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:		ll be entered and an e	explanation of			
Claim(s) objected to:						
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-13,15-32,34-49,51-67 and 69-72</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE						
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>						
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to of showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar	overcome all rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fai	ils to provide a			
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanatio REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attach	ned.			
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered bu See Continuation Sheet.	, , , ,	•	nce because:			
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).	(PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper N	lo(s)				
13.  Other:	_	JUSCUMA SUSANNA M. DIAZ	. /			
	P	RIMARY EXAMINE	:R			

AU3623

Continuation of 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): The objection to the Title is withdrawn in response to applicant's amendment to the Title.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's argue in remarks filed February 27, 2006 that there is no motivation to combine Primavera and Merant (Page 4, Lines 18-20) since Merant is designed to be used with in Integrated Development Environment.

Examiner respectfully disagrees, both Primavera and Merant represent systems/methods for managing projects - specifically both address, albeit by providing different features, change management/control elements necessary for successful project management wherein Merant clearly provides a robust mechanism for tracking issues related to project tasks/activities that are being managed. Further motivation for combining project management and change control/issue management can be found in at least the following previously cited referencesees: McDowell, Pages 31-32; Lientz et al., "What Methods and Tools Will Be Employed for Project Management", Pages 116-117, "How do Templates, Issues, Lessons Learned, and the Plan Link?", Page 120; UniPress Software Launches New Relase, Paragraphs 3, 5; Page 1).

Examiner notes no proposed claim amendments were submitted with the remarks filed February 27, 2006; therefore claims 1-13, 15-32, 34-49, 51-67 and 69-72 stand rejected as discussed in the Final Office Action mailed October 27, 2005.